



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,567	08/27/2003	Frank D. Garber	0103-0036 (ZM0521)	5973
43231	7590	01/20/2006	EXAMINER	
ZIMMER TECHNOLOGY - REEVES			REIMERS, ANNETTE R	
P. O. BOX 1268			ART UNIT	
ALEDO, TX 76008			PAPER NUMBER	
			3733	

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,567	GARBER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Annette R. Reimers	3733	

All Participants:

(1) Annette R. Reimers.

(2) Cary Reeves, reg.#35,334.

Status of Application: Non-Final

(3) Eduardo Robert.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 January 2006

Time: Morning

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Examiner's Response to Arguments.

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 7, 12-17 and 20-22.

Prior art documents discussed:

Noiles (US Patent Number 3,848,272) and English (US Patent Number 4,004,300).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 EDUARDO C. ROBERT
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Mr. Reeves, applicant's representative, on Friday, January 13, 2006, to discuss the claims in the application. Examiner pointed out to Mr. Reeves that the means for language in claim 1 was not interpreted under 112 6th paragraph, because the means for language included structure in addition to function. Examiner suggested amending the claims and possibly the specification to more particularly claim the spherical thread profile. Mr. Reeves presented arguments regarding the claims and the Noiles and English prior art references. Examiner suggested that Mr. Reeves present the arguments in written format and that examiner and her supervisor would review the arguments and any amendments to the claims.